

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

In re:

STREAM TV NETWORKS, INC., *et al.*,

Debtors.

STREAM TV NETWORKS, INC. and  
TECHNOVATIVE MEDIA, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SHADRON L. STASTNEY, SLS HOLDINGS  
VI, LLC, HAWK INVESTMENT HOLDINGS  
LIMITED, ARTHUR LEONARD ROBERT  
“BOB” MORTON, SEECUBIC, INC.,  
ALASTAIR CRAWFORD, KRZYSZTOF  
KABACINSKI, KEVIN GOLLOP, ASAFA  
GOLA, JOHN DOE(S),

Defendants.

Chapter 11

Case No. 23-10763 (MDC)

Adv. Case No. 23-00057 (MDC)

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, on October 9, 2023, the above-captioned Debtors, Stream TV Networks, Inc. (“Stream”) and Technovative Media, Inc. (“Technovative,” and together with Stream, the “Debtors”) filed the *Debtors’ Motion to Reduce the Period to Produce Requested Documents in Connection with Debtors’ Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, and Permanent Injunction* (the “Motion”).<sup>1</sup>

**AND**, by the Motion, the Debtors seek an order compelling the above-captioned Defendants to produce documents pursuant to certain document requests (the “Document

---

<sup>1</sup> Bankr. Docket No. 54.

Requests") on or before October 12, 2023, at 12:00 p.m.<sup>2</sup>

**AND**, upon consideration of the Motion, it is hereby **ORDERED** and **DETERMINED** that:

1. The Motion is **DENIED**.
2. Requests for expedited discovery are analyzed according to a good cause standard. Courts commonly consider the following factors: (1) whether a preliminary injunction is pending; (2) the breadth of the requests; (3) the purposes for requesting the expedited discovery; (4) the burden on the defendants to comply with the requests; and (5) how far in advance of the typical discovery process the request was made. *See, e.g., American Legalnet, Inc. v. Davis*, 673 F.Supp.2d 1063, 1067 (C.D. Cal. 2009) (citing, *inter alia*, *Disability Rights Council of Greater Wash. v. Wash. Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 234 F.R.D. 4 (D.D.C. 2006), which in turn cited *Entm't Tech. Corp. v. Walt Disney Imagineering*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19832 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 2, 2003)).

3. Here, applying the above factors, the Debtors have not established that expedited discovery is warranted. First, no preliminary injunction is pending. Rather, the Debtors are seeking the expedited discovery in connection with the continued hearing on their temporary restraining order request. Second, the Document Requests are extremely broad and seek documents and communications related to 11 expansive categories. Third, the burden on the Defendants to comply with the Document Requests is extraordinarily high given their broad nature. Finally, the 48-hour response time sought is markedly shorter than the typical 30-day response deadline provided for under the applicable federal rules. *See* F.R.B.P. 7034 and F.R.C.P. 34(b)(2)(A).

4. Because the Debtors have not established good cause, grounds do not

---

<sup>2</sup> The Document Requests were filed separately from the Motion at Bankr. Docket No. 53.

exist to grant the Motion.

Dated: October 11, 2023



---

MAGDALENE D. COLEMAN  
CHIEF UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE